DoN FYDP Improvement Project

New... | New Revision

Go

[Go Back]
Meeting Notes
Reports/White Papers
Progress Reports
Presentations
Instructions
Room Index
Room Security

Tools

🔍

news: daily | weekly
advanced search

chat | notify | print |
tutorial | help

Meeting Notes 9-26-00 (Tom Simoes Navy Programming)

Elaine Kujawa (Elaine Kujawa), 09/27/2000 - 02:08 PM

Date: 9-26-00
Subject: Meeting with Tom Simoes (Branch Head of Navy Programming - N80)
Client Attendance: Tom Simoes
KPMG Consulting Attendance: Steve Schwab and Elaine Kujawa

Areas of Discussion:

General Comments on work flow and information flow within the PPBS process:

- The *transition* from the Programming to the Budgeting phase is where the problems are. The major problems are not with the individual processes themselves however.
- The DoN POM becomes the starting point for the DoN Budget and the DoN Budget becomes the starting point for the next DoN POM. It is an iterative process.
- The "Prior years FYDP information" input on the IDEF0 model is a very broad term. It includes a lot of different information and is the baseline that RSs use to develop the POM.
- N82 submits both the POM and the Budget.

N82 and N80 maintain different database (WINPAT - N80 and NBTS - N82) because OSD requires two different formats when submitting information – appropriations and Program Elements (PEs). OSD is driving part of the historic lack of coordination between programming and budgeting. To an extent, no matter what N80 and N82 do to coordinate better, they are still slaves to OSD and their information requirements.

The Resource Sponsors need accurate baseline information when developing the POM.

Discussion of Information Systems that support the Programming process

- The main database is WINPAT.
- N80 also uses MS Excel extensively during the POM build – it allows for greater security because the WINPAT database is open for everyone to see. They can use Excel internally to N80 and restrict who sees it.
- There is a significant amount of offline spreadsheets being

used. Information is usually then re-keyed into WINPAT.

Recommended speaking with a few of the major Resource Sponsors:

- N6
- N4
- N88

Reviewed the IDEF0 model (Navy Programming) to date. Overall, the IDEF0 model looked accurate.

- Recommended some changes to the interaction of the SPPDs and BAMs with regards to SPP development.

- ZOWs can be issued at any time after the RSs submit their SPP briefs and up to the point that SECNAV reviews and approves the POM.

- The R3B and the IR3B process has been changed and are now called R2B / IR2B. A new instruction on the R2B / IR2B process was issued (OPNAV Instruction 5420.108B) detailing this change. We received a copy and will review and incorporate any significant changes to the model.

The Sponsor Program Proposal (SPP) takes the form of updates to WINPAT in addition, to a hard copy cover letter that summarizes the updates and major changes.

There is room for improvement in how action on Component Commander Issue Papers (CCIP) is tracked. After CCIPs are received, they are reviewed and are either funded or not funded. Generally speaking, if they are not funded it is for one of two reasons. The first is that there is a lack of funding. The second is that the RS believes the issue should not be funded. If they are not funded, there is often times poor communication back to the fleet as to why they were not funded. Communications back to the fleet could be improved.

Need to look at how N82 submits the database to OSD. WINPAT is converted to NBTS before being submitted.

OSD is a big player in the process. It may be beneficial to talk to someone in OSD.

Program Elements – Believes if OSD would back off the requirement to use PEs, then N80 would have no problem dropping PEs as the basic data element in WINPAT and instead use appropriations / BLIs/CLIs. This would allow N80 to interact with Budgeting more effectively because appropriations / BLIs are what NBTS and budgeting use.